CITY OF REDMOND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

August 16, 2012

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting. Tapes are available for public review

in the Redmond Planning Department.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: David Scott Meade, Joe Palmquist, Craig Krueger, Lara Sirois

EXCUSED ABSENCE: Scott Waggoner, Mike Nichols

STAFF PRESENT: Steve Fischer, Principle Planner; Dennis Lisk, Associate Planner;

Thara Johnson, Associate Planner

RECORDING SECRETARY: Susan Trapp with Lady of Letters, Inc.

The Design Review Board is appointed by the City Council to make decisions on design issues regarding site planning, building elevations, landscaping, lighting and signage. Decisions are based on the design criteria set forth in the Redmond Development Guide.

CALL TO ORDER

The Design Review Board meeting was called to order by Chairperson David Scott Meade at 7:09 p.m.

PRESENTATION

Description: Presentation of the new e-Zoning Code & Property Viewer **Staff Contact:** Thara Johnson, tmjohnson@redmond.gov or 425-556-2470

Ms. Johnson demonstrated the new electronic Zoning Code and Property Viewer, which went live on the Friday before this meeting. The City undertook an effort to rewrite the Zoning Code in 2010, with a goal to come up with a completely electronic platform for the Code. Since the Code was adopted, several members of the City's Planning Department and the GIS Department have worked together with a consultant to create a unique product that that integrates zoning regulations and property research. The City is also holding a launch event for this product on September 6th at 7:30 a.m., and the DRB members are invited. Members of the press will be invited as well.

Ms. Johnson showed the DRB the portal that leads to the e-Zoning Code and Property Viewer. The Property Viewer has an interactive map that allows a search by parcel number, taxpayer name, street address, and zone. Ms. Johnson searched for the Mayor's property. She displayed a pop-up menu that lists a number of details about the Mayor's property. One can click on the zone designation and see a synopsis of what the specific zoning regulations are for that area. Anyone looking for more information will be directed to the Zoning Code text that applies to the parcel one is researching. Looking through the Zoning regulations, development details are provided to viewers for a specific zone, including densities and setbacks. Also, a list of allowed uses within a certain zone is provided.

Several pop-up menus appear under setbacks, for example. If you want to know what zero-lot line development means, there is a pop-up box that tells you. On the menu, one can review the complete definition. If you want to take regulations about a certain zone on the go, you can select the "generate .PDF" button to generate a document to save, print, or email. There are also links to several user guides that the City has created over the past year. Review procedures, which deal with the DRB's work, have been linked in this way. One can also view all the properties that are one type of zone within the City through the Property Viewer, as well. Property details for a specific property can be printed out, too.

There are several layers to the Viewer, including a look at how affordable housing regulations are applied, and a zoning overlay, which provides links to any development regulations and overlay regulations that apply. If there is a development agreement, a link is provided to a .PDF document. Another feature that staff worked very hard on is the land use lookup tool. If you wanted to find out where to put a property of a specific use but did not know what category it would fall under in the Zoning Code, you could type in a

word like "bakery" and then search. All the categories are provided at this point, such as grocery, food sales, general sales or service. When you make a selection, it will take you back to the part of the Code that deals with that type of property use. A menu of options is provided, as well, with a map of the areas a bakery would be allowed in. Then, if you want to find out what properties are for sale or lease that would fit that use of a bakery, you could find photographs of those properties and details of the site via a link to the commercial property listing.

Through the Zoning Code, one can also get to the Property Viewer through the interactive map function. One can also access the land use lookup tool through that function. If you wanted to search for design standards, for example, in the Zoning Code, the search would be similar a Google or Bing search. This feature is based on staff's compilation of what the most significant hits would be. There is a phase two proposed to the website to enhance it further by linking permitting and land use information to the Property Viewer, as well as other capabilities. Mr. Krueger asked about the listings of properties in the process of approval. Ms. Johnson noted that was on another web page on the City's website. Mr. Fischer said that could be linked in a later phase. Mr. Meade said the site was excellent and made his job easier.

Ms. Johnson said the website improvement was a yearlong process. She is not aware of any other jurisdiction that has a link between Zoning regulations and property listings and the other information provided. Other jurisdictions are curious about what Redmond has done. Mr. Krueger asked about the launch event and who would be invited. Ms. Johnson said the development community, One Redmond, the City Council, the Planning Commission, and Code Rewrite Commission have been invited. Mr. Krueger asked about aerial photos for the properties, and Ms. Johnson demonstrated how that was linked, and how one could follow a link to King County Assessor's data. Bing Maps have been added along with Google Maps. Mr. Fischer said this type of site has been the goal of the City for some time as a way to make Code regulations more accessible to the public. Mr. Krueger said it was amazing. Ms. Johnson noted that there was an archiving feature, where one could research the history of an ordinance over several years, for example. The DRB thanked Ms. Johnson for her work.

CONSULTATION

PRE120017, Bear Creek Apartments

Description: 6-story mixed-use building; 65,509 square feet of multi-family and commercial with one

level of underground parking

Location: Bear Creek Parkway and 178th PI NE **Applicant:** Nora Pena Klenner *with* Driscoll Architects

Prior Review Date: 08-02-12

Staff Contact: Kelsey Johnson, kmiohnson@redmond.gov or 425-556-2409

Mr. Fischer spoke on Ms. Johnson's behalf. He noted that this site is on Union Hill Road, and would be a six-story, mixed-use building with about 105 units of housing with ground floor retail on the south side and one level of subterranean parking. This project was before the Board previously on August 2nd. There has been a quick turnaround from the applicant to make sure the project is heading in the right direction. There are now new color schemes, roof line modifications, a change in window configuration on the south side of the building, a curtain wall on either side of the main entrance, a variation in siding materials and patterns on the south and west elevations, and a green wall along the west elevation.

The staff report speaks to the design elements, which include a building setback issue. This was discussed at the last meeting, and still needs to be addressed. The stream buffer setback will require a modification of the balconies. The plaza may need additional landscaping to screen the elevated plaza wall. As regards building details, materials and colors, staff is concerned about the proposed color palette and how compatible it would be with the surrounding neighborhood. Along the north elevation, in the back, there have been no changes. The Board commented on that elevation, including the recommendation of a more dominant entry. There is nothing on this elevation that would indicate an entry.

Architect Nora Pena Klenner spoke on behalf of the applicant. She reviewed some of the changes made, including the changed roofline. Some of the overhangs have been extended to create more dramatic ends to the buildings. The windows in the middle are gone, replaced with a great curtain wall that would

become a light tower at night. With regard to color, the applicant has proposed one alternative that includes a teal hardy plank siding and metal with the curtain wall in between and yellow towers that signal vertical movement in the building. A stained concrete element would be down below. A second color scheme alternative would be edgier, with some bright reds and urban gray and dark metal colors. The entry signal would be smaller because it is a residential area, but the design would create an area that is friendlier to move around in. A third alternative has more woodsy-looking planks, but still with an urban look using dark blue hardy plank panels and metals in between.

The applicant noted that there is parking all along the back side of the building, so the back walls would not always be seen. She is looking for guidance on what would be best in this area. The applicant said a local artist could provide a mural in this spot, or the type of material could be varied to create a pattern. The west side could have a green wall, which may or may not work due to sunlight. Therefore, a mural or a nice color pattern would probably be the preferred options. The landscape architect put more plantings in front, and he has also redone the roof. He also included P-patch areas on the roof as well, as recommended by the DRB. The plantings here would take advantage of the rain. The applicant showed some before and after pictures to show how the site has changed.

The main things the applicant would like feedback on would be the color schemes and the entry areas. She responded to the comments about hiding the equipment on the roof, and the applicant showed how plantings would provide a screen for that. Utilities like garbage are inside the building and a screen would not be needed. Permeable pavers are still on the site, but some impermeable pavers have been added in the back around the vehicular access areas. There is now a four and a half-foot walkway in the back so that people getting out of their cars would be led to the entrance to the residences.

The applicant presented a materials board, including stained concrete, colored pavers, aluminum storefront elements, seamless metal siding, hardy lap siding, fiber cement panel, the glass curtain wall, and metal balcony elements. The applicant showed that there was a lot of visual breakup on the windows, and some windows have been eliminated. Mr. Meade confirmed that pre-painted hardy plank colors would be used. The applicant showed two red colors, a dark gray, and a yellow. Mr. Meade said a golden yellow would be more tailored for the site. Wood-textured hardy plank would be used for the woodsier alternative. The other color alternatives would use smooth texture.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked about the roof terrace and how many square feet would be allowed. The applicant said there
 was a concern on that, but she was not sure what that square footage was. She said she has done
 twenty buildings with large roof decks in a similar way, with two exits, as required.
- The applicant said that the Redmond Code specialist she has been dealing with has not gotten back to the applicant as to why the square footage might be a problem. As she interprets the Code, there should not be a problem.

Ms. Sirois:

- Asked about the site plan and confirmed that all the retail would be on the south side.
- Ms. Sirois said this area of the City is not pedestrian-oriented yet, but asked if the entrance could
 present a shared use for pedestrians and cars. She suggested creating the project's own street with
 parallel parking in front of the store to create a more urban look.
- The applicant said that was possible, and noted that the project used to look that way many years ago. At some point, it was decided to put the parking in the back. The applicant said the reason for that change was that buffer averaging was used in the past, but that is now not allowed.
- The applicant noted that the building has been pushed to the street along the setback line, and the dimensions of the site would not allow for a driveway in front of the building.
- Ms. Sirois said in response that there should be a better approach from the parking to the retail spaces. She wanted to make sure there was something to pull people from the parking to the retail spaces, and said the applicant should make more of the plaza area in regard to pedestrians.

- Ms. Sirois asked if there could be some access through the center of the building for people just using the retail space. She said people parking on the back side, on the north, should be able to go through the building. The applicant said people could go through the lobby.
- Ms. Sirois said the yellow color appears a little too "safety yellow" in the renderings, and she would like a sample of it. She likes bright colors, but wanted to make sure brighter colors were used judiciously on a building of this size.
- She suggested toning down some of the colors, commenting on the bright blue and bright yellow presented. At least one of the colors should be toned down, in her opinion. The applicant said a full set of the colors could be provided for the DRB's perusal.
- Ms. Sirois said the red color appears cold, and would suggest a warmer rust-like color to contrast with the metal elements on the project. She likes the form of the project, however.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Said the elevations look a lot better in terms of the windows, especially. He likes the roofline adjustments as well.
- Mr. Palmquist is concerned about the yellow color. He likes it in the drawings, but is concerned how it
 would turn out. He likes highlighting the vertical circulation, but that color needs more work.
- He pointed out that there is a strong line between the first and second floor, and he liked the fact that it breaks. He suggested a similar theme in the front. The canopy appears to be at the same height, which might be complicating the design. He was not sure if the canopy could be raised to break up the horizontal line. The applicant said that could work.
- Mr. Palmquist said Ms. Sirois' idea of creating pedestrian and driver areas in the front of the project, but admitted that with no buffer averaging, that might not be possible. He said the retail spaces, if they were oriented more towards the side, might be a solution.
- The applicant said that sounded like a good idea, and said signs could be used to point out the store locations from the parking area. Ms. Sirois says other things than signage could be used, such as paving that would pull someone from back to front.
- Mr. Palmquist said the side orientation he mentioned could help solve the issue of getting people more easily from the parking to the retail.
- He said the project has made a lot of progress, and was on the right track. He suggested the
 applicant keep progressing and explore some of the options from the DRB presented at this meeting.

Mr. Krueger:

- Repeated his concern from the last meeting regarding the attached walk along NE Union Hill Road, saying it was an unfriendly environment for pedestrians.
- He said there had to be some way for the sidewalk to come up the hill to bring a person up to the plaza and back down again. He wanted to make sure the sidewalk, on a busy street, could be linked to the plaza in a better way.
- The applicant said street standards could complicate that. Mr. Fischer said the applicant could explore with staff different ways to shift the sidewalk off of Union Hill to provide a better buffer between the sidewalk and the project. An easement might be an answer, Mr. Krueger said. The applicant and Mr. Fischer said they would explore that option.
- Mr. Krueger prefers the first alternative in terms of colors. He was not sure about the woodsy look, but liked the first alternative for its edginess. He noted that some of the elevations were drafted in a very rigid way. The elevations with the red color have a softer rendering that does not look so rigid.
- Mr. Krueger appreciates the way the windows have been changed, but would like to see a better, three-dimensional look at the ins and outs of the building. The applicant agreed that machine-drafted and hand-drafted elevations can look different.
- Mr. Krueger said the colors look very vertical, and asked if some horizontal changes could be added, as well. He would like to see the project broken up in different ways with regard to color.
- Overall, Mr. Krueger liked the way the project was going and appreciated the way the applicant listened to the DRB, particularly about the windows. As far as the materials, with regard to metal and hardy plank, he would like to see all the materials lined up next to each other.
- Mr. Fischer asked if a detail of a certain material would help. Mr. Krueger said photos could be even
 more helpful, just to see the subtleties of the seams. The applicant said the rendering could be more
 accurate, with lighter lines for a better view of the project.

Mr. Krueger asked about the metal and glass balconies. The applicant said the idea was to provide some variation. The glass wall would bleed into the balconies near it, but near the ends of the building, the balconies have more metal as a way to bleed into the metal elements there.

Mr. Meade:

- Said the organization of the colors could change. He suggested a tripartite organization for some of the massing. The vertical tower pieces could stay, but a story and a half could be some color at the top of the vertical masses to give a base, shaft, and capital concept to the building.
- Mr. Meade asked about the base color, and suggested that could be painted a rich color to give a strong base element to the project, perhaps red or another strong color.
- He said the building has come a long way. He said that renderings, as Mr. Krueger mentioned, could be improved to provide a better sense of the building. He said the perspective elevations were helpful.
- The applicant said that the timeframe for this project was moving quickly, and asked if approval for this project could come by the end of this month. Mr. Fischer said the next meeting of the DRB was September 6th.
- Mr. Meade said if the applicant did what was asked at this meeting, the DRB would consider approval
 in that first meeting of September. Mr. Fischer said that proposal would have to include a set of
 elevations, and a landscape plan for the roof and plaza.
- Mr. Fischer continued that the applicant should not concentrate on the enhancements to the buffer in the back. He asked the applicant to concentrate on the landscaping of the building, not the native landscaping in the back.
- Mr. Fischer would like to see colors specified, with 4 inch by 4 inch samples provided, as well as materials. He said samples could be put up on a board. The applicant agreed to provide this information and the details.
- With regard to color, the DRB urged the applicant to pick a color she liked and have an alternative in reserve. Mr. Meade suggested scrapping the blue and brown and work with the other two schemes provided, with the adjustments the DRB mentioned.
- Mr. Palmquist said the colors can be worked out during an approval meeting, as well. Mr. Meade said bringing boxes of materials would be helpful.
- The DRB and applicant thanked each other for their time.

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE120023, Cascade Plaza Renovations

Description: Renovations and site improvements to an existing retirement residence

Location: 7900 Willows Road **Applicant:** John Shoesmith

Staff Contact: Dennis Lisk, dwlisk@redmond.gov or 425-556-2471

Mr. Lisk said this was a pre-application meeting for this renovation and site improvement to the Cascade Plaza retirement facility. This property is off of Willows Road and Redmond Way at the south end of Willows Road. There are two buildings. One is a nursing home, which is the Cascade Vista building. The other is an assisted living facility, which is the Cascade Plaza. There are a few landscape improvements and a reconfiguration of the parking lot for the Visa building. The main portion of the actual building changes would be for the Plaza building. Some of the work includes a new entry canopy, changes to the exterior facades, new landscaping near the front canopy, and parking changes. The Plaza building is a long building that has a dogleg which separates its north and south portions. In the south portion, there is a large covered entry canopy which right now is a colonial design with large pillars and a gable. Beyond that, the south end and north portions of this building have a mansard roof currently with brick facades and Marblecrete. All of the exterior building improvements would happen on this portion of the building.

Those improvements include a new entry canopy that is a radical shift from what is onsite right now. Staff had some comments about that. One concern is about the transition between that look and what would remain on the north portion of the building. There is some hardy panel screening over the façade as well as a new screen wall proposed between the parking lot and the first floor units. Staff would like to know more about the materials and colors proposed here.

Architect John Shoesmith spoke to the DRB on behalf of the applicant. He showed the Board how the building would be perceived by passing drivers and pedestrians. The building nestles into the landscape, such that from Willows Road and Redmond Way, on the upside, the public would look at the building top-down, through bushes and trees on site. Driving by, one might even miss the fact that there is a building in this location. The applicant showed a panoramic view of the Cascade Plaza's south wing, central wing, and north wing. The Vista building is one story with a flat roof and a little articulation at the entry. The Plaza is a very linear building as well with a mansard element and traditional entry. The applicant said he was taking cues from the existing building and its linear nature, as well as the relationship between the Plaza and Vista buildings. At all the entries, there is a consistent motif of using brick or masonry as an entrance indicator.

The applicant showed the elevation of the north end of the Plaza building and the dogleg of the structure. The dogleg goes out of view as one comes from the Vista side of the site. The two buildings are attached, but they were built at two separate times. An entry stair separates the buildings now, and there are separate mansard roofs. Looking from Willows Road, the applicant showed a perspective of the linearity of the two buildings. The central and south wings are getting the most work on the project.

The applicant reiterated that the buildings are perceived parallel to the front elevations, and they are low and linear. Brick has been used to indicate entry throughout the site. The Vista building is perceived with the south and west wings, where most of the work would happen. The north wing is hard to perceive until one gets around the corner of the project. The applicant showed the site plan for the Vista property. The existing road will remain. No work for tenant improvement would be done at the Vista at this time, which is the nursing home. However, the owner is interested in beautifying the parking lot. Currently, when one drives in, the dumpster is the first item one sees. The idea is to relocate the garbage, do some landscaping, and reconfigure the parking lot. The applicant wants more space between the drive and the resident room windows. Right now, the two are very close together. Also, the applicant wants to provide some landscaped islands that would interrupt the parking to break up its massing.

On the Plaza side, most of the work is happening in the south and central wings. The applicant is looking for a reconfiguration of the parking lot. Again, the idea is to pull the road away from the building face, create areas of landscape that can provide some screening in association with some site wall elements, and provide tree islands to, again, break up the massing of the parking lot. The central area is the common space on the first floor of the building. The plan is to reconfigure the waiting area and the dining area. There is an addition off the back which is an energy-inefficient, pre-manufactured sunroom. The applicant would replace that within its existing footprint. On the south end of the first floor, the applicant has proposed a fifteen-unit Alzheimer's portion of the building with an Alzheimer's courtyard in the back. Upstairs, there would be a corridor and common space reconfiguration primarily meant for tenant improvement.

The owner is asking for a radical re-understanding of the main entry. From a marketing standpoint for senior housing, the old colonial look is not that popular for the new generation of seniors. The applicant is looking for cues in the existing building to be able to create a new look for the Plaza building. The applicant's goals include leveraging the use of the existing brick to indicate entry and bringing the scale of the entry canopy down. The canopy springs off the very top of the building. It feels big and tall when one is under it. Some resident windows are under those canopies, too, which create a very dark look. Another goal would be to provide weather protection while also maximizing the amount of natural light that could get into the resident room windows on the second floor and the common spaces as well.

There is an existing brick firewall in this area, as well. The applicant is trying to tie that wall, compositionally, with what is going on in the rest of the entry piece of the building. The applicant is trying to reinforce the linear nature of the building at non-entry spaces to support some of the landscape items. The applicant admitted that the building is full of warts, with mechanical louvers, for example, plunked into several locations in a random nature. The back of the building is the front of the building because there is no access to the back. Thus, between the upper and lower floor windows, there is a variety of louvers, vents, and screens. The goal is to clean that up a bit.

The applicant is trying to tie the building, screen, and site wall vocabulary together to create little rooms. Right now, with the parking configuration, people drive up and park against the windows. The hope is to provide a buffer between the parking and the residents to make it more livable. The applicant wants to make this change to both ends of the building. From an affordability standpoint, the choice has been made to create improvements where possible and try to select methods that could apply to the north end in the future.

The applicant wants to play up the brick element around the entry and create a fin wall that then would support the canopy. Steel columns have been proposed at the entry. The canopy would be shaped in such a way so that, at the door, there is something nine feet overhead that then steps up to allow buses under it, for example. Screens would be hung on the front of the building that would act to accentuate the linearity of the building and hide the warts mentioned earlier. The applicant says there are some items on site, such as transformer vaults, that are front and center. Therefore, the concept of varying the height of the screening to hide some things is under review by the applicant. The plan is to create an entry with a more human scale that allows light to come in and penetrate through the site.

The landscape plan includes a lot of trees. There is a steep slope off the back side of the site. A trash compactor has been moved on the site, and will need some screening. The plan involves a more landscaped look for three units looking off the back side of the project. Landscape interest would build through the entry of the site. The screen walls would start defining spaces as outdoor rooms for resident rooms to view. Where that is not possible, landscaping would come in, with tree vocabulary to unify the site. The site screen walls would continue in front of the north part of the plaza building to tie it together. Native plantings would be used. Sensitivity would be important at the rear of the building, where the Alzheimer's courtyard would be. Non-toxic plantings would be used. A variation of plant heights would be introduced such that the borders would not be walls, but boundaries to block headlights from coming in, for example.

Materials for the project include the existing Marblecrete. The screen would be a fiber cement board with integral color going through it. The existing brick would remain. The brick would be matched on the fin wall supports for the canopy. Aluminum windows would remain on the project. A color similar to the cool shade in the cement board siding would be used for the metal support on the canopy, beams, and coping. To bring the fin wall into the entry, the applicant is suggesting painting the Marblecrete and the panel in between a darker color to pull it in as part of the composition. Under the roof canopies, a wood panel system would be used. In the Alzheimer's area, there are three windows that would be replaced where the common areas are. The applicant has proposed a vinyl window to be used for the replacement.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Ms. Sirois:

- Said that she did not see an overall site plan that would show the exact extent of the exterior modifications. She was concerned about staff's issues about how existing and new elements would work together. She said it would be helpful to have that overall plan.
- Ms. Sirois said, in a vacuum, the proposal looks great. She likes the style and massing. She is worried about Marblecrete but understands the applicant's budgetary concerns.
- She asked about landscaping, and if it would go along the entire building. The applicant said the landscaping would go around the compactor. Trees have been added in that area and the whole front façade of the north wing with changes in the configuration of the drive.
- The applicant added that new islands and new landscaping would go around the front portion of the central wing. At the entry canopy in the front of the south wing, landscaping would bleed to the back of the site where the Alzheimer's courtyard and dining areas would be.
- Ms. Sirois asked if the views of the site would be softened by landscaping. The applicant said that was indeed the case. Ms. Sirois said that would be good to see in the renderings. She would also like to see a vignette of where the old and new construction would come together.
- The applicant said the plan in the future is to remove the mansard roof from the old construction to help match up the building more appropriately. That would be phase two of the project, but there is no timetable for that to happen.

• Ms. Sirois confirmed that there was nothing happening along the building to the south. She appreciated the efforts to match the existing building, which would minimize any jarring visual effects. She said that was beneficial. She reemphasized her desire to see how the project would transition between old and new elements.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Echoed Ms. Sirois' request to see a better look at the main transition points of the project.
- Mr. Palmquist would also like to see what the ground is doing underneath the site, including curbing, concrete, and landscaping. The applicant said a more developed rendering would help.
- In general, Mr. Palmquist really likes what he sees. He does not like the perspectives of the site from the ends. He suggested more work to be added to those end areas. He suggested wrapping around one line on the end to push the brick pilaster further inside the roof area.
- Mr. Palmquist asked about painting the Marblecrete. He confirmed that some landscaping would go in front of the Marblescape. The applicant admitted that creating a rendering that shows the landscaping at the entry would be helpful to provide context.
- Mr. Meade asked if the Marblecrete wall would be changed. The applicant confirmed he would not.
- Mr. Palmquist asked if there was a joint pattern to the Marblecrete. The applicant said that was not the case. Mr. Meade said a saw could cut such a pattern into the Marblecrete. Mr. Palmquist asked if there was anything other than a new color that could be added to change up the Marblecrete.
- Mr. Meade noted that the upper floor above this material had a window, and suggested continuing the screening proposed on the site. The applicant said because of the change of use of the spaces downstairs, he could remove some complications and clean the facade up in this location.
- Mr. Palmquist appreciated the effort of painting the Marblecrete, and echoed Mr. Meade's suggestion
 to put a continued screen in front of it. However, he did not want to make the project busier. Other
 than that, Mr. Palmquist said the project was fine.

Mr. Krueger:

- Liked the project, especially the central portion. He wished it could be moved to the south so that more people could see it.
- Mr. Krueger liked the form and the fin walls, which he says work very well. He liked the idea of matching the brick at the entries. The applicant noted that the site walls will interact with the landscaping so that the landscaping bleeds into other parts of the site.
- Mr. Krueger liked the screen itself and its modulation around the site. He was hopeful that the buildings would be pulled together in a better way in the future to create a more cohesive look.
- Overall, he liked the materials and colors provided and what the applicant had started with.

Mr. Meade:

- Said anything done to this site would be an improvement, and noted there was not much landscaping on the site at present.
- Mr. Meade said the brick look at the entries might not help the applicant update the look of the site as he would like. Mr. Meade suggested painting the brick rather than matching it. He normally does not like painting brick, but this would be an exception.
- Mr. Meade said painting the brick could change the building even more and still retain the brick material. He said he would like to see the whole building integrated, but understood it would go a piece at a time.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the entry to the Vista building. The applicant pointed out where Mr. Krueger was looking to clarify the location.
- Mr. Meade said the Board would look forward to having the applicant come back soon for approval. Mr. Lisk said a land use permit would not be required for this project, as the applicant is not adding any new units or new density to the building. The parking would not be subtracted from. Landscaping has been added.
- Internally, staff believed that the project could go forward, but felt that with all the exterior changes, a
 DRB review was necessary. Mr. Meade said the DRB could approve this project at this meeting, and
 give staff some leniency to oversee any changes.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MS. SIROIS TO APPROVE PRE120023, CASCADE PLAZA RENOVATIONS, WITH THE STANDARD CONSISTENCIES REGARDING ELEVATIONS AND COLORS. STAFF WILL HAVE THE ABILITY TO WORK WITH THE APPLICANT TO FINALIZE THE DESIGN BASED ON BOARD COMMENTS AT THIS MEETING. THE APPLICANT WILL CONSIDER PAINTING THE BRICK ON THE SITE. MOTION APPROVED (4-0).

ADJOURNMENT

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:00 P.M. MOTION APPROVED (4-0).

October 4, 2012	
MINUTES APPROVED ON	RECORDING SECRETARY